# Social Action Digest

Contents:

Editor: Hubert F. Schiffer, S.J.
Loyola University
New Orleans 18, La.

Card. Cushing: ...Moral Problems of Gossip Columns
W. White: .....Why Can't We Have Pay TV?
J. Fitzpatrick: ..The White-Collar Society (Part 2)
Dept.of Commerce: Income of U.S. Families

Vol. II, No. 3 March 1959

## MORAL PROBLEMS OF "GOSSIP COLUMNS"

Excerpts from an address by Richard Cardinal Cushing, Boston, Mass.

Famous men and women often find that they "have no more privacy". Is this the penalty one must pay for outstanding performance in our modern society? Do "professional gossips" have an unlimited right to shout their opinions from the rooftops? The following excerpt from an address of Richard Cardinal Cushing at the 6th annual journalists' Mass on Jan. 25, 1959 in Boston, reminds us of some important moral issues involved in the freedom of the press. Reprinted with permission from THE PILOT (49 Franklin St., Boston 10, Mass.) Jan. 31, 1959, p. 18.

Newspapers very often concern themselves almost exclusively with events and in our times events are happening so quickly as to be easily the pre-occupation of editors. Sometimes it is possible for us to forget that the center of the world is still man, that history is the story of man, and civilization the product of his genius. News is significant principally as it affects man, and any record of the day which leaves out the human element or merely touches it lightly distorts the true values of our existence.

In this connection I have been thinking recently of the young lady reporter who took herself to prison rather than reveal certain sources of information used in her column. I suppose it is natural to feel a certain sense of chivalry in her regard -- she suffered, according to her claims, in order to protect the position of another. For my part, I will leave it to those more learned in the law than myself to pass a definitive decision on the celebrated case; in a conflict of rights such as this one, there are many aspects of the case to be studied and the claims of justice move in many directions. For myself, I would prefer to comment on a matter which stands at the source of the incident itself and has been little discussed, but deserves some consideration from us all.

The original item of news which began the controversy and raised so many questions was, in a simple everyday phrase, a "bit of gossip". Normally, we do not take seriously the problem of "gossip"; we think of it generally as something

CIAL ACTION DIGEST (published monthly, except July and August) presents applications of sound principles to the con-
e problems of modern life, especially in economics, by printing excerpts of articles and speeches by well qualified experts.
s, SOCIAL ACTION DIGEST hopes to stimulate intelligent discussions of vital topics and promote action to strengthen
private enterprise system and the ideals of freedom in a democratic society. Subscription: $1.00 a year.

associated with elderly ladies gathered about a tea table and with men having nothing else to do. For the most part it is fair to say that "gossip" is harmless. It is clear, however, that it can become dangerous, and indeed immoral, when it touches the good name and reputation of others. This does not mean merely that we should be careful not to tell lies about our neighbors, but that in certain cases we cannot even tell the truth, if such a revelation will destroy a reputation and serve no just purpose. These principles we have learned in our youth and so we know the moral evil of detraction, which reveals a damaging truth about another, as well as calumny, which reports a lie about another.

## Professional Gossips

Now for several decades we have had growing up in the newspaper world a whole batch of writers who must be termed "professional gossips". Things were bad enough when the only gossips we had around were the back-fence variety and other amateur forms; it has become intolerable now that the whole business has gone professional with newspaper writers making a living out of it, and in some cases, I dare say, a fortune out of it. Of course, I know that much of these columns is made up of items of a pleasant and happy nature, and I know that there are some columnists who show good taste and restraint in discussing the lives of celebrities.

But I also know that there are some who handle the lives of their neighbors with no sense of values at all and with no respect for reputations. In little staccato lines they feed the hungry public the evil food of malicious gossip; they quietly destroy their subjects and just as quietly poison their readers.

Gossip of the kind I refer to is essentially unkind, and it caters only to the instinct of curiosity in man, the busybody tendency which lurks beneath the surface of the best of us and looks for opportunities to be satisfied. Moreover, gossip is also unjust, for it nearly always damages the reputation of others (cont'd on p.3)

---

**SOCIAL ACTION DIGEST gets around ...**

Social Action Digest's growing popularity is shown by its fast increasing circulation figures. They jumped from 500 in December 1958 to 1,100 in March 1959. Social Action Digest is now read in 33 states and 7 foreign countries. The following states as yet do not receive Social Action Digest: Alaska, Arkansas, Delaware, Georgia, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North and South Dakota, South Carolina, Tennessee, Utah, West Virginia and Wyoming. (Poor dears, they don't know what they are missing!)

Social Action Digest has no "advertising budget" and must rely entirely on the recommendations of satisfied readers. Are you satisfied? If you are, why not recommend Social Action Digest to your friends and business associates? Or, better still, send them a $1.00 gift subscription for one full year? It's a thoughtful gift and says in effect: "Dear friend, I think you belong to the socially alert and leading citizens and I am sure you will enjoy these thought-provoking articles." Who wouldn't be grateful to you! Besides, you will be helping to promote freedom (eternal vigilance is the price of freedom, remember?) against creeping Socialism and other powerful attempts to undermine our way of life. The time for ACTION is NOW.

If you want to send one or more gift subscriptions to your friends, you will find enclosed a convenient order blank and a return envelope. This gift subscription blank will be sent only twice a year: in March and October. In order to simplify our office work, which has increased substantially due to the growing list of subscribers, volunteer helpers are sending this enclosure to all names on our mailing list, including those who have recently sent gift subscriptions. You see our special mailing permit requires that all envelopes contain exactly the same material.

"Gossip Columns" (cont'd)

Professional Gossips

Now for several decades we have had growing up in the newspaper world a breed of writers who must be termed "professional gossips". Things were bad enough when the only gossips to be found were the back-fence variety and other amateurs; it has become intolerable now that the whole business has gone professional with newspaper writers making a living out of it, and in some cases, I dare say, a fortune out of it. Of course, I know that much of these columns is made up of items of a pleasant and happy nature, and I know that there are some columnists who show good taste and restraint in discussing the lives of celebrities.

But I also know that there are some who handle the lives of their neighbors with no sense of values at all and with no respect for reputations. In little staccato lines they feed the hungry public the evil food of malicious gossip; they quietly destroy their subjects and just as quietly poison their readers.

Gossip of the kind I refer to is essentially unkind, and it exists only to the detriment of curiosity in man, the busybody tendency which lurks beneath the surface of the best of us and feels for opportunities to be satisfied. Moreover, gossip is also unjust, for it nearly always damages the reputation of others (cont'd on p.3)

---

SOCIAL ACTION DIGEST gets around ...

and takes away from them their good name or the remnants of their proper esteem in the community. It might also be noted that gossip has a very debilitating effect on the character of those who make a practice of indulging in it. It is the product of small minds and it encourages small-mindedness.

## A Right to Know?

A newspaper is a free enterprise, it sets out to find the news and to give it to the public. At the same time every editor and indeed every reporter knows that he cannot print all the news, he must select and reject, and he must have a formula for preferring the one and setting the other aside. There is, in plain terms, some news "fit to print" and there is some news that is not "fit to print". A good publisher and a good editor know how to make the distinction between the one and the other.

Some people speak a great deal about the so-called "right to know". This is a very precious idea and it lies at the heart of the democratic society, as we know it. The public has a "right to know" many things about the conduct of government, the state of society, as well as any and all the public events which make up a passing day. At the same time there are many things that are not public property; we just do not have the right to know everything about everybody.

It has never been a rule of good journalism that we have a right to print everything we can find out about everyone in the world. Alongside the concept of "right to know" we must set the principle of "fit to print". Beside the ingenuity of the reporter who finds out hidden facts we must be sure to encourage the restraint of the editor who knows which ones will serve legitimate interests and which will unjustly bring damage to others.

The newspaper is not an irrational machine into which we can carelessly throw the news, and let the results fall where they may. Newspapers are run by newsmen and that is why they must be answerable, as man is answerable, to laws higher than themselves.

## The Human Climate

We know that newspapers are a kind of daily textbook in the education of the readers, that minds are informed and personalities affected by their reading. This places a high responsibility on the newsmen of a city, for they can be said to set the human climate of the areas they serve.

Keep before you the thought of man himself as the center of your work; do not permit situations and events to smother the true value of things so that the human factor becomes merely one more among many.

There are matters far more important than putting out big papers or vast numbers of papers; you must be certain to put out good papers which do not wither the spirit of those who write them or those who read them. Newspapers are made for men by men and unless they help to make all men better, then they are truly without significant purpose. The focus you take in every day's work can make the difference, and it is the difference between success and failure. (The End)

**********

COMING EVENTS: You will read the following articles in the April number of SOCIAL ACTION DIGEST:

* Property in the American Environment
* Education for Leadership
* The Decline of the American Male
* Important New Books: Foreign Aid, Working Women, Sociology.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2024

https://archive.org/details/modern-society_1959-03_2_3

Would you pay to get better programs which are now too expensive for advertisers to put on "free TV"? If so, you may want to raise your voice

# Why Can't We Have Pay TV?

By W. L. White

IF SOMETIMES you complain about the quality of the programs you see on your TV set, if you wonder why so many of them are dull or tawdry and constantly interrupted by commercials, remember this: you are not allowed to pay to see what you really want. Instead you may look only at what it is to someone else's interest to let you see. The miracle is that television is as good as it often is.

The American advertiser, TV's sole means of support, has imposed on him by law—that is, the regulations of the Federal Communications Commission—a monopoly to provide you with "free" entertainment. Last year he spent $1,291,000,000 on TV advertising. Since there are 43 million television families in the United States, your family's share of this was $30.02, or an average of approximately eight cents a day. About five of those eight cents must go to operate the stations. The cost of the actors, writers, newscasters and so on must be squeezed out of the approximately three cents left over. So, if what you often get is a comedian mumbling jokes to an ape, don't blame the advertiser. It is all he can afford.

Nor are the owners of most TV stations getting rich on their five-cents-per-day cut. Out of the 1880 commercial channels allocated by the FCC only 501 are filled, and about 30 percent of those stations, according to latest FCC figures, operate at a loss. Channels have been allocated for 1238 cities, but only 318 can find advertisers to support TV. Nor is there likelihood of much improvement.

For the set-owner, the only hope for getting the type of television entertainment he wants seems to be

Pay TV.* Without it, both set-owners and station-owners are in for a lean time.

But will people pay to see better programs? The best answer was provided by a 1951 experiment in Chicago, authorized by the FCC. In this test a group of families chosen to represent a typical cross section of the U. S. population were provided with devices enabling them to receive a feature movie not available over free television. They could see these movies, all of which had played in nearby theaters, for the relatively high price of $1. The families were offered 90 pictures during the 90-day test.

Result: each family spent an average of $1.73 a week. Movie producers were astounded. For television has hit movie attendance so badly that the average American family now goes to the movies only once or twice a month. Here, when relatively recent features could be watched at home on TV, each family was eager to pay to "go to the movies" seven times a month!

Moreover, when a sampling of these test families was interviewed a few years later, 99 percent said they were eager to have Pay TV back again, because it saved them money. When the average American family starts out for the movies, it may mean hiring a baby-sitter, paying either bus fare or a parking-lot fee, plus several theater tickets. The total cost is seldom less than $4. But for only $1 the whole family could enjoy the same picture on Pay TV at home and maybe invite in the neighbors.

If that's the case, why doesn't Hollywood show its films on regular TV and let the advertiser pick up the tab? The trouble is that the cost of new film entertainment is far beyond anything a TV sponsor can pay. Compare, for example, the cost of a good movie with the meager sums that makers of soap, cosmetics or beer can spend on TV. "I Love Lucy," starring Lucille Ball, for years the most popular weekly show on TV, cost the sponsor about $85,000 each week (including the network's time charges). But when the same theme and star became a movie, *The Long, Long Trailer,* Hollywood spent $1,500,000 on it. TV sponsors can't afford such prices.

Good movies cost money, and then make it. *The Greatest Show on Earth,* produced by Cecil B. De Mille, cost four million dollars and grossed more than 12 million. *Oklahoma* cost almost seven million and grossed more than 20 million. Early in 1958, *Around the World in 80 Days,* released at a cost of six million dollars, had already grossed over

*Several companies have developed metering schemes which will allow you to pay for special programs. All can be attached to your set at little cost once Pay TV is legalized. One is a small box with dials like those of a tiny safe which, when properly set, decode a scrambled picture sent out from the TV station; at month's end you are billed only for those programs you chose to unscramble. In another, you drop the number of coins needed to unscramble a picture into a box—emptied by the company each month. Still another involves a special card, mailed to you each month, to be inserted in the meter. This card will unscramble the programs you care to buy.

two million dollars in one Broadway theater, and over one million each in two theaters in Los Angeles and San Francisco.

Millions of set-owners, without Pay TV, will probably never live to see the time when such costly pictures have completed their runs and can be sold to TV at a sponsor's price. But with Pay TV, set-owners could probably have many good movies in their homes within a year of release, and at a much lower cost than their families now pay at the box office. And Hollywood, quickly getting its money back, could turn out fine films at a faster rate.

Sports are another field where Pay TV would bring tremendous advantages, both to viewers and to those providing the programs. At present, free television is eating itself right out of this field. It has affected baseball, for instance, in two ways. In the last two years 25 minor-league baseball clubs—a principal breeding ground for the majors—have folded. The reason: thousands of their fans have stayed at home to watch major-league games for nothing. And the major leagues have been hit by the fact that advertisers cannot pay a major-league club enough to make up for what free television is doing to its gate receipts.

While the Braves were in Boston, for example, TV helped pull attendance down from 944,391 in 1950 to 281,278 in 1952. When the Braves moved to Milwaukee and banned telecasts, attendance soared to more than two million. Other clubs have had similar experiences—with the result that telecasting of home games has been blacked out completely by six of the major-league clubs, severely limited by six others. And this blackout will probably increase because, as Frank Lane, general manager of the Cleveland Indians, points out, "If we continue to sell our games for what TV sponsors are willing to pay, baseball can't survive. If we don't get Pay TV, most clubs will have to drop telecasting altogether."

In boxing, a total TV blackout has already settled over big matches. Only three heavyweight championship battles have appeared on free TV since 1952. All others have been driven into movie theaters wired for television, available only to a few, who pay from $3 to $7 each. Pay TV in homes could greatly increase the take for the matches and vastly reduce the cost for the viewer.

Football, too, has been going off the air. College after college has found that games on TV produced huge bald spots in the stadium and deficits in the athletic budget. As a result, the National Collegiate Athletic Association has allowed only restricted telecasting of college sports events since 1951. Now it is believed by a number of members of the NCAA that Pay TV, properly administered, would bring a wide variety of college teams into the living room and put college athletic financing back on a sound basis.

Television today, ruled as it must

be by the needs of the advertiser, tends to ignore minorities. The sponsor must choose programs which will appeal to the statistical majority of set-owners. This is like a statistical shoe, planned to fit the "average" foot from ages 4 to 40, which actually would fit almost no one. For instance, really fine music is seldom telecast, since it lacks the mass appeal advertisers must have. But many Americans are willing to pay to hear it. An estimated 35 million persons support 1055 symphony orchestras scattered across the country. The 321 million dollars spent in 1956 on concert admissions, printed music and recordings, plus high-fidelity equipment, was 80 million dollars more than the paid admissions to all spectator sports.

This minority, able and eager to pay for what they want, could, for a trifling cost under Pay TV, bring concerts into their homes several times a week, free of commercial interruptions. Instead, what few they now get (often necessarily subsidized in part by the networks as a public service) are usually on Sundays or during "off hours." The convenient listening hours are sold as "prime time," typically for a quiz show which is cheap to produce but often leaves the set-owner wondering why he bothered to tune in.

Consider what Pay TV might do for New York City's Broadway. About 60 shows open on Broadway each year, but only one in four makes a profit. Many of those which close have high merit and would have strong appeal for a selected audience beyond the New York area. Ralph Bellamy, president of the Actors' Equity Association, who urges Pay TV, points out that while a smash hit on Broadway might be seen by only 400,000 people in a year, under Pay TV "20 times that number might see the *première* alone."

Educators have long eyed television wistfully as a potentially enormous force in *their* field. Dean Charles C. Caveny of the University of Illinois, who pioneered the Navy's wartime research in visual education, estimates that 50 percent of the work required for a college degree could be taught over television. But of the 256 channels allocated to educational television, only 31 have obtained sufficient subsidy from colleges or endowments to operate. Were such stations allowed to sell a few hours a night to aspiring students, most of the empty channels would be filled. This would bring to thousands of young people who cannot afford four years on a campus those brilliant professors whose inspired courses are now heard by only a favored few.

A national debate rages over Pay TV. Late in 1957 the FCC announced plans for a limited test. But last February, Congress, bowing to the anti-Pay TV pressure, asked the FCC to postpone the test until next year. Unanimously against Pay TV are owners of movie houses, who fear that first-run features on TV would be the death blow to the Main Street movie house. Far more

effectively against it are the heads of the huge TV networks which now dominate the industry.

Frank Stanton of CBS says that it would bring a blackout of free programs because "each time a scrambled [Pay TV] signal goes out over the air, it necessarily blacks out a free signal." Those who favor Pay TV answer that this would be more than counterbalanced by the greatly increased number of new stations which Pay TV would make possible and profitable, most of them probably free of network control and offering each set-owner a choice of ever more free programs.

Robert Sarnoff, president of NBC, fears that Pay TV will raid free TV of its programs, since it "must seek television stars of established popularity" with the result that "free television, its principal attractions siphoned off, would be forced into a downward spiral." Pay TV promoters reply that free television's programs are safe because "Pay TV couldn't get anyone to pony up an admission price for most of the stuff you see on free TV today."

Free TV might lose an occasional star to Pay TV. But on the whole it would be enormously improved. The healthy financing which Pay TV would bring should enable stations to upgrade the quality of their free programs.

In a 1956 survey 70 percent of the big TV advertisers favored giving Pay TV a try. They want, for their sponsored programs, that high-class audience—"the missing third" —who now usually leave their sets dark even in the peak viewing hours, but who would turn them on if better free and paid programs were available.

What does "the public" think? This depends on who asks what question. If the networks ask, "Would you like to pay for programs you now get free?" the answer is a thundering "No!" But if those who have seen Pay TV demonstrated are asked if they would pay to get better programs now barred from free TV, 93 percent in one test thundered, "Yes!" Of this group 83 percent were eager to pay to see Broadway shows, 78 percent wanted new feature movies, 58 percent wanted educational courses, 56 percent sports events, 53 percent grand opera and 29 percent better children's programs.

Such answers seem to prove, as Irving Kolodin wrote in the *Saturday Review,* that "the conception of America as a nation of free-loaders, loath to pay for what it wants and indifferent to quality as long as it has quantity, doesn't ring true!"

Congress, how about clearing the track for that experiment?

**REPRINTED BY SPECIAL PERMISSION OF THE READER'S DIGEST.** This article has been reprinted by the Reader's Digest under the following conditions: (1) That supplying this reprint does not imply any endorsement by the publisher, of any persons, firms, products or services. (2) That no one outside the Reader's Digest may affix any other reading matter to it.

*Reprinted from the November 1958 issue of The Reader's Digest*
*Copyright 1958 by The Reader's Digest Association, Inc. Pleasantville, N. Y. Printed in U.S.A.*

## THE TREND TOWARD A WHITE-COLLAR SOCIETY (Part 2)

Excerpts from an address by Rev. Joseph Fitzpatrick, S.J., professor of Sociology at Fordham University, at the 4th National Catholic Social Action Conference, held at the University of Notre Dame, Sept.5-7,1958.

In a cynical and often bitter book (WHITE COLLAR), Mills complains against the "alienation" of the white collar classes. The salesman and salesgirl bargain their personality for a commission. The work (of selling) is played like a game; a whole pattern of false behavior must be adopted in order to make the selling effective. Nor is the relationship of salesclerk to customer a personal relationship. It is one in which the customer is manipulated, first by advertising, then by the sales techniques of the salesgirl. Work is alienated from the human person.

Alienation takes place in a second way. With excessive division of labor and mechanization of work, a man's work is no longer an expression of himself. Rather the workingman submits to a set of routines which are often boring, and which he follows only because it is the means of getting the money by which he can purchase the things he wants.

Finally, bureaucracy has made business routine and impersonal, compelling the individual to submit himself to the impersonal system if he is going to survive.

The heart of the trouble, according to Mills, lies in the failure of the white collar classes to organize politically. Mills betrays a Marxist background in his conviction that the deepest human problems can be settled by the right kind of political organization. He is angry with the white collar workers that they have not exerted the power of their position in order to give direction to American life. What direction this would be, Mills never clearly defines.

The predominant theme of David Riesman's work (THE LONELY CROWD) is not alienation, so much as conformity. We are at a point in American life where two great currents meet: a technological development that leaves the vast majority dependent upon others for their employment; and a social development in which many of the older values of the American people have shifted or have been lost.

Two things then happened which set the stage for that type of personality which we have come to associate more and more with a white collar society. Technological development and the growth of huge and complicated organizations made it impossible any more for most men to achieve anything on their own. Development, achievement, even discovery and invention are activities that men can do only in groups.

A second thing happened also. Values began to be obscured. Society inherited a great many commonly accepted values from previous generations. This framework gave men a security, and gave their lives a consistency that enabled them to chart individual courses in an ocean that had a set of common guideposts. But gradually, the common values and ideas gave way before uncertainty, indefiniteness, obscurity. At a time when men were developing a technology that threw them into a very deep dependence on one another, they found that they had to depend on each other for the support of their own weak values; with no consistent norms to guide them, they guided themselves by depending on the values that seemed to be widely held in the groups around them.

This is provoked still more by some of the major institutions of a white collar society: advertising, mass communication; the need of a mass market to consume what is mass produced.

The third author, William H. Whyte (in THE ORGANIZATION MAN), places the danger of a white collar society not so much in alienation, nor even in conformity, but in

the fact that conformity which was once considered a weakness, has come to be proposed as the major moral virtue of a highly organized society.

Whyte does formulate the central problem of our time as the problem of the need for individual activity and expression. Whyte makes a plea for the individual -- but the practical ways by which the individual is going to express his personal values and strive for personal ends, in the presence of a highly organized world, is never satisfactorily presented.

Against the background of these critical analyses, I would like to make some comments.

## Comments

1. Our white-collar culture has developed in the United States, in a culture that has been changing rapidly, in a culture in which one most significant feature has been the coming of millions of poor immigrants and their phenomenal rise socially and economically.

There are two things to note about this. First, the very breaking up of the old cultures made possible the development of the United States. Our society was not rigidly bound or limited by traditional ideas or practices.

The second aspect is the fact that people who have gone through the cultural experience of America do not have deep cultural roots in anything. They expect change; they are uncertain of many of the important features of today's life because they are afraid it will not be part of tomorrow's life.

It is precisely this lack of sharp cultural definitions that inclines people to seek in the groups that surround them, the norms according to which they expect to live. Consequently, it has always seemed to me that much of the concern with conformity which is attributed to the values of a "white collar" society, is more the result of our cultural history.

2. The question of alienation is given careful attention by every writer who analyses contemporary American life.

What is very evident in our developing white collar society is that group activity will be a common characteristic of our lives. I sometimes fear that we romanticize the satisfactions and the meaning of work of men in the past. Craftsmen were always a small minority -- hard toil was the ordinary lot. I can't imagine that anyone who had anything to do remotely with the building of the Nautilus or the Skate; with the construction of a Jupiter rocket or a jet plane, does not have some sense of achievement in seeing even a picture of the final outcome of his work.

It would seem, then, that what I would call "group virtues" will have to be an important psychological and spiritual consideration in the future.

In this context, let us examine for a moment the problem of "group virtue" that is discussed by Whyte in THE ORGANIZATION MAN. He calls it "conformity". In Whyte's discussion, the main point of view is (1) the desire on the part of the vested interests to get others to conform. In this way their vested interests are protected; (2) the desire on the part of the strivers to conform to the demands of the organization. In this way the strivers advance themselves in the organization. In other words, Whyte's discussion singles out for attention the selfish objectives for which organizations can be used to the detriment, not only of society at large, but also of the people involved.

The one aspect that Whyte fails to consider is the fact that our welfare does depend today on organization; the promotion of the general welfare is today, and

will continue to be, inevitably related to the effective functioning of huge and complicated forms of organization.

Therefore, I think there is definitely place for a discussion of organization virtues. If so much of the welfare of the world depends on organization, men must cultivate the virtues that will enable them to participate effectively in this organization activity. I would say, therefore, that organization virtues would be the following: the work of preparing ourselves technically in order to participate effectively in organization activity. By technically, I am thinking not only of the mastery of machines but the mastery of that whole range of physical, social and administrative sciences which are coming to play so important a part in our white collar world; secondly the willingness to sacrifice my own personal desires and interests in order to fulfill those duties which are obviously needed if organizations are going to work effectively; thirdly, the political aspect of a highly organized society, active participation in those organized groups which enable me to exercise intelligent control over the destinies of the organization and of the people involved in it.

All of this requires a high level of intellectual effort and moral responsibility. If the challenge can be met, and I sincerely trust that it can, our white collar society will compel men to a much higher level of human perfection and development in the rational and moral control over their lives and destinies.

(The End)

**********

## INCOME OF U.S. FAMILIES

Some of the highlights of the results of the annual inquiry on consumer income made by the Bureau of the Census and published in Current Population Reports (U.S. Department of Commerce), Series P-60, No. 30, Dec. 1958. (This report covers money incomeonly, prior to deductions for taxes.)

Average (median) family income in the U.S. was estimated at $5,000 in 1957, or about 4% higher than in 1956. (The median income is the amount which divides the distribution into two equal groups, one having incomes above the median and the other having incomes below the median.) However, this $200 gain in money income between 1956 and 1957 represented no significant change in purchasing power for the average family, since prices also rose substantially during the period. (The Consumer Price Index of the Dept. of Labor averaged 116.2 in 1956 and 120.2 in 1957.)

Of the nation's 44 million families (groups of 2 or more related persons), about 4 million (or 9%), received incomes of $10,000 or more and an additional 18 million (41%) had incomes ranging between $5,000 and $10,000. At the other end of the income scale, 6½ million (15%) had incomes under $2,000. The remaining 15½ million were in the $2,000 - $5,000 bracket.

### Incomes Differ by Extent of Employment

Sharp rises were recorded by year-round workers. Men who worked at full-time jobs for 50 weeks or more had an average income of $4,700 — a gain of about $260, or 6%, over the previous year. In contrast, men with less than a full year's employment had an average income of $2,000 in both years. Women who worked around the year had an average income of $3,000 — a gain of about $175, or 6%, over the year before, whereas the average income of other women workers was about the same ($900) in both years.

About four-fifths of the 53 million men with income in 1957 were employed at

full-time jobs, that is, jobs generally providing at least 35 hours of work per week. The median income of these men was $4,300, as compared with $8000 for men who worked only at part-time jobs, and $1,000 for those who were income recipients but did not work at all during the year because they were retired or disabled or for other reasons. Three-fourths of the men who were employed at full-time jobs worked 50 weeks or more during the year. As might be expected, these men had higher incomes, on the average, than did other full-time workers, among whom the median ranged from $600 for those who worked less than 3 months during the year to $4,100 for those who were employed for 11 months.

A similar pattern of income by extent of employment occurs among women. About ½ of the 33 million women with income worked at full-time jobs. Their average income was $2,200, in contrast to the $500 received by women who worked at part-time jobs and $600 for those who were income recipients but did not work at all. Most of the women who worked at full-time jobs were employed 50 weeks or more during the year. The median income of these women ($3,000) was higher than that of other women who worked at full-time jobs, with medians that ranged from $400 for those who worked less than 3 months to $2,300 for those who worked 11 months.

**********

## The Three-Dimensional Man

Quotes from A.M. Sullivan, THE THREE-DIMENSIONAL MAN (Kenedy & Sons, New York, 1958), Chapter 1.

The three-dimensional man has a personal integrity, a community responsibility and a spiritual awareness. Out of them is derived his estimate of the rewards of the technical, aesthetic and communal. He believes in freedom, justice and democracy.

The three-dimensional man looks upon education as a continuing process which includes the experience of every day. He permits no day to pass until it teaches, verifies, enlarges, or explains some significant fact or incident in life. The years are an unreliable measure of the mental age of people. Reading, discussion, debate are the gymnastics of the brain, and exercise keeps the mental muscles flexed and responsive. The young mind, regardless of body age, looks forward and is concerned with the political and economic issues of tomorrow. The young mind is lively in anticipation rather than relaxed for reminiscence. The mind learning new things, trying new thoughts, testing new opinions is alert; while respecting established principles it toys with new evidence, new procedure, new problems. The strong mind is never seduced by old fallacies in sequins, nor sophistries posing as virtues under a fraudulent moral code.

Truth never winces when it meets the probing eye, nor changes complexion in the sunlight. Men who have a deeply rooted faith in eternal values can risk certitude against any evidence, and survive stronger in their beliefs for the challange. It is a week faith that eschews the questions, or sidesteps the challenge of a doubt.

Learning is not the acquisition of facts. It is the selection and processing of information until it is absorbed by the mind as the tissue of meaning that gives shape and feeling to truth.

*** *** *** *** *** *** *** *** *** *** *** *** *** *** *** *** ***

The NEW LOOK: Beginning in May, SOCIAL ACTION DIGEST will appear in an easy-to-read 8-page offset edition.